

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

LESTER JOHN SUNDSMO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

13-cv-682-jdp

DANIEL GARRIGAN, a.k.a. d.b.a. DANIEL
GARRIGAN and all Marital Relations,

And

DENNIS RICHARDS, a.k.a. d.b.a. DENNIS
RICHARDS and all Marital Relations,

And

JOHN F. ACCARDO, a.k.a. d.b.a. JOHN F.
ACCARDO and all Marital Relations,
d.b.a. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE DIVISION OF CRIMINAL
INVESTIGATION,

ALAN J. WHITE a.k.a. d.b.a. ALAN
J. WHITE and all Marital Relations,

And

GARY FREYBERG a.k.a. d.b.a. GARY
FREYBERG and all Marital Relations,

And

ROY R. KORTE a.k.a. d.b.a. ROY R.
KORTE and all Marital Relations,
d.b.a. ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF WISCONSIN,

And

JOHN DOES #1, #2, #3, #4,#5
and all Marital Relations,

And

JOHN DOES/JANE DOES etc., #6-200?,
et al. and all Marital Relations,

And

COUNTY OF COLUMBIA
COMMISSIONERS
and all Marital Relations.
a.k.a. d.b.a. COUNTY OF COLUMBIA
INC. In their individual capacity
d.b.a. Carl C. Fredrick Administration Bld.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Lester John Sundsmo brought this action against various Columbia County and state of Wisconsin officials. In an April 15, 2015 order, I dismissed the case for plaintiff's failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, following plaintiff's several attempts at submitting allegations understandable enough to give defendants fair notice of the claims against them. Dkt. 71.

Plaintiff has filed two responses to the April 15 order. First, he filed a document titled as an "objection" to the order dismissing the case, arguing that I could not dismiss the case because I was named as a defendant, and that defendants improperly filed responses to his complaints signed only by their attorneys. Dkt. 73. Neither of these arguments have any merit. As I stated in the April 15 order, plaintiff failed to show a reasonable ground for my recusal. In particular, I noted that "nothing in the proposed second amended complaint would lead a reasonable, informed observer to think that I am biased against plaintiff or that plaintiff has any viable claims against me in this lawsuit." Dkt. 71, at 6. I also concluded that plaintiff's argument about defendants' attorneys signing their filings was frivolous. *Id.* at 8.

Plaintiff's second response is titled as a motion to reopen the case based on new evidence, but plaintiff does not actually present any new evidence. Dkt. 77. He instead

reiterates the same frivolous arguments I have already rejected. Nothing in either response persuades me that I was incorrect in dismissing the case. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that both of plaintiff's motions for reconsideration of the April 15, 2015 order are DENIED and this case remains closed.

Entered June 2, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

/s/
JAMES D. PETERSON
District Judge